A U M

Him I call a Brahamana for whom there is neither this nor the further shore. Fearless and free, he is beyond both.

—*The Dhammapada*

# THEOSOPHY

**Vol. L** **May, 1962** **No. 7**

## THE EVOLUTIONARY SCHEME

ALONG with the psychological revolution of the twentieth century—the progressive revival of philosophical ideas of the self, the gradual return to primary ethical values, and the intensive study of psycho-dynamics which characterizes the present—we may expect a fresh study of history. The new life gained by any one of the fundamental propositions of *The Secret Doctrine,* in the thought of an age, must eventually call into being a like concern with the other propositions, since the light given by one has a natural attraction for its companion principles and also depends upon the illumination they give.

Knowledge of the self is largely intuitive in origin—least dependent, one might say, upon rational processes. Yet it provides the stance from which the inquiring mind may use its powers to good effect. The mind can tell us little or nothing concerning the changeless aspect of being, but the mind is all-important to an understanding of all those regions of being which are affected by the great cycles of evolution. So it is that we pass naturally from fresh insight on the idea of the self to the quest for clearer conceptions of the meaning of experience, and this requires two great investigations—study of law and study of egoity. Law, one might say, is the universal frame of experience, and egoity is the quality of individual being which relates the processes of life to evolutionary ends.

In *The Secret Doctrine,* the section titled "Cyclic Evolution and Karma" begins with the sentence: "It is the Spiritual evolution of the *inner,* immortal man that forms the fundamental tenet in the Occult Sciences."

Here, by implication, we have in outline a conceptual frame of the entire evolutionary process. The importance of this cannot be exaggerated. In these days of universal frustration, disillusionment, and aimlessness, one great question occurs insistently to all thoughtful human beings. *What,* they ask themselves, is going on? The answer to this question has a rational ground, and that ground is the evolutionary scheme to be found in *The Secret Doctrine.*

We do not ordinarily think of H. P. Blavatsky as a "savior." The idea would no doubt have been embarrassing to her, not so much for its personal reference, which she would have impatiently brushed aside, as for its anachronistic sound. "Saviors" belong to the past, not to the present. The role of the Savior has its natural setting in epochs where the psychic principles of man's nature are undergoing critical development. The psychic principles are shaped and led by a higher authority. They are given discipline by the mold of cultural forms. A Savior is one who, out of regard for the incomplete nature of mankind, does for people what they cannot yet do for themselves.

But with the further incarnation of Manas, the relationship of the principles of man's nature undergoes a fundamental change. The "saving" function is internalized in the individual. A new rhythm pervades the evolutionary process. The symbols and personifications of traditional teaching are transformed into abstract conceptions of philosophy. The drama of self-discovery is intensified by becoming increasingly inward for every human being. Plato might be thought of as the inaugurator of this extraordinary transition in the processes of human development, while H.P.B., in the work of the Theosophical Movement begun in the nineteenth century, brought it to a climax. For the understanding of this change, *The Secret Doctrine* is the text.

A more profound knowledge of the self means, as we pursue its implications, a wider perspective on all the temporal relationships of the self. This means a knowledge of history. And since history is ultimately a record of the "Spiritual evolution of the *inner,* immortal man," the student finds himself needing to see in the past the sign-posts and benchmarks of this kind of development. Not the rises and falls of empires, the conquests and migrations of races and nations, but searchings of the human mind for meaning mark off the great cycles of evolution. In these terms, *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* are treatises of universal history. The secular events of the past are but the reflexes, the

shadows, of inner transformations, working their way out on to the scene of gross events. Here and there, often in single sentences, are laid down the principles of the study of human history. "The evolution of the GOD-IDEA proceeds apace with man's own intellectual evolution." It is possible, by means of reflection, to interpret the entire course of European and American history as a spiritual exercise in the quest for knowledge of self and deity. Even the agonies of the present international impasse are rooted, not obscurely, in raging assertions concerning the nature of man and the principles of human development.

That the solution of this terrible conflict should lie in the recognition of impersonal, philosophical ideas would no doubt be incredible to the contestants, and most of all to their leaders, is to be expected. For, "Outside of initiation, the ideals of contemporary religious thought must always have their wings clipped and remain unable to soar higher; for idealistic as well as realistic thinkers, and even free-thinkers, are but the outcome and the natural product of their respective environments and periods." Yet, when we read this, we may at the same time consider that publication of *The Secret Doctrine* was itself an initiatory rite in behalf of the development of the entire human race. It was as instruction for all, and not for a chosen few, that H.P.B. wrote:

> Nor would the ways of Karma be inscrutable were men to work in union and harmony, instead of disunion and strife. For our ignorance of those ways—which one portion of mankind calls the ways of Providence, dark and intricate; while another sees in them the action of blind Fatalism; and a third, simple chance, with neither gods nor devils to guide them—would surely disappear, if we would but attribute these to their correct cause. With right knowledge, or at any rate with a confident conviction that our neighbors will no more work to hurt us than we would think of harming them, the two-thirds of the World's evil would vanish into thin air. . . . The suppression of one single bad *cause* will suppress not one, but a variety of bad effects.

The issue of evolution is no longer a question of arguments between theologians and scientists, providing material for Sunday supplement features. Not salvation, pretended or actual, is the concern of men, but simple survival. "We stand bewildered before the mystery of our own making, and the riddles of life that *we will not* solve, and then accuse the great Sphinx of devouring us." H.P.B. wrote not alone for scholars and would-be occultists, but as an interpreter of future as well as past history, with the welfare of all at stake. "We have not long to wait,"

she said in the Introductory of *The Secret Doctrine,* "and many of us will witness the Dawn of the new Cycle, at the end of which not a few accounts will be settled and squared between the races." Already it is possible to see some of the trial balance sheets in this operation of karmic book-keeping.

What is the role of the Theosophical Movement during these days of crisis? Only unfolding events can answer this question, but we need not wonder what H.P.B. had hoped for from the workers in the Theosophic cause. When Emile Burnouf remarked, "If the T.S. succeeds in refuting this pretended law of the struggle for life and in extirpating it from men's minds it will have done in our day a miracle greater than those of Sakyamouni and of Jesus," she replied (in the pages of *Lucifer,* August, 1888):

> And this miracle the Theosophical Society *will* perform. It will do this, not by disproving the relative existence of the law in question, but by assigning it to its due place in the harmonious order of the universe; by unveiling its true meaning and nature and by showing that this *pseudo* law is a "pretended" law indeed, as far as the human family is concerned, and a fiction of the most dangerous kind. "Self-preservation," on these lines, is indeed and in truth a sure, if a slow, suicide, for it is a policy of mutual homicide, because men by descending to its practical application among themselves, merge more and more by a retrograde reinvolution into the animal kingdom. This is what the "struggle for life" is in reality, even on the purely materialistic lines of political economy. Once that this axiomatic truth is proved to all men, the same instinct of self-preservation only directed into its true channel will make them turn to *altruism*—as their surest policy of salvation.

The work of the Movement, then, is to place before all those who will listen, the principles of human development, the laws of evolution, and the teaching of who and what evolves. These, in this cycle, are the only means to salvation *and* survival. Conviction of the truth of these great ideas arises from the study of history as the drama of soul evolution, of current experience as the interplay of the inner ego with the circumstances and events of life. The engagement of great masses of men in bitter struggle over partisan theories of meaning is sufficient evidence of the readiness of the world for teachings which take their inspiration from timeless philosophic principles, however slowly their pertinence may become clear to those who are most involved.

# "SPIRITS" OF VARIOUS KINDS

YEARS have been devoted by the writer to the study of those invisible beings—conscious, semi-conscious, and entirely senseless—called by a number of names in every country under the sun, and known under the generic name of "spirits." The nomenclature applied to these denizens of spheres, good or bad, in the Roman Catholic Church alone, is endless. The Greek Kyriology of their symbolic names is a study. Open any account of creation in the first Purana that comes to hand, and see the variety of appellations bestowed upon these divine and semi-divine creatures—the product of the two kinds of creation (Mahattattva and Bhuta—the primary and the secondary), all evolved from the body of Brahma. The Urdhvasrota[1] alone, of the third creation, embrace a variety of beings with characteristics and idiosyncrasies sufficient for a life-study.

The same is true of the Egyptian, Chaldean, Greek, Phœnician, or any other account. The hosts of these creatures are numberless. The old Pagans, however, and especially the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria, knew what they believed, and discriminated between the orders. None regarded them from such a sectarian standpoint as do the Christian Churches. They dealt with them far more wisely, on the contrary, as they made a better and a greater discrimination between the natures of these beings than did the Fathers of the Church, according to whose policy all the angels that were not recognized as the attendants upon the Jewish Jehovah were pronounced devils.

We find the effects of this belief, afterwards erected into a dogma, asserting themselves now in the Karma of the many millions of Spiritualists brought up and bred in the respective beliefs of their Churches. Though a Spiritualist may have divorced himself for many years from theological and clerical beliefs, though he be a liberal or an illiberal Christian, a deist or an atheist, having very wisely rejected belief in devils, and being too reasonable to regard his visitors as pure angels, he has taken up what he thinks a reasonable mean. He will acknowledge no other spirits than those of the dead.

---

NOTE.—This article by H. P. Blavatsky first appeared in *Lucifer* for June, 1896, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for September, 1917.

[1] Urdhvasrota, the Gods so called because the bare sight of aliment stands to them in place of eating, "for there is satisfaction from the mere beholding of ambrosia," says a commentator on the *Vishnu Purana*.

This is his Karma, but it is also that of the Churches collectively. In the latter such a stubborn fanaticism or a *parti pris* is only natural: it is their policy. In the free Spiritualist it is surely irrational. There cannot be two opinions upon this subject. It is not a question of either belief in or rejection of the existence of any "spirits." If a man is a sceptic, an unbeliever, we have nothing to say. But when once he believes in the "spirits of the dead" the question changes. Where is that man or woman who, free from prejudice and preconceptions, can believe that in an infinite universe of life and being—let us say even in our solar system alone—in all this boundless space in which the Spiritualist locates his "Summer-Land," there are only two orders of conscious beings: men and their spirits; embodied mortals and disembodied immortals?

The future has in store for humanity strange surprises, and Theosophy—or rather its adherents—will be vindicated fully in no very distant ages. It is no use to re-argue a question that has been so fully discussed in *Isis Unveiled,* and that has brought only opprobrium, enmity, and persecution on the writer. Therefore we will not go out of our way to say much more. The elementals and the elementaries of the Kabalists and Theosophists have been sufficiently ridiculed, but, sadly enough, far too insufficiently dreaded. Nevertheless, from Porphyry and Jamblichus down to the demonologists of the past centuries fact after fact has been given and proofs heaped upon proofs, but with as little effect as might be expected from the fairy tales told to Mr. Huxley in his nursery.

A queer book, that of the old Comte de Gabalis, immortalized by the Abbé de Villars, has been translated and published. Those who are humorously inclined are advised to read it and ponder over it. This advice is offered with the object of drawing a parallel. The writer read it several years ago and has now read it again with more attention than formerly. Her humble opinion as regards the work is that one may search for months and never find the line of demarcation between the "spirits" of the séance-room and the sylphs and undines of the French satire. There is a sinister ring in the merry quips and jests of its writer who, while pointing the finger of ridicule at that in which he believed, had probably a presentiment of his own speedy Karma in the shape of assassination.[2] The way he introduces the Comte de Gabalis is worthy of imitation—by unbelievers:

---

[2] The work was published in Paris in 1670, and in 1675 the author was cruelly murdered on his way to Lyons from Languedoc, his native country.

"I was astonished one Remarkable Day when I saw a man come in of a most exalted mien: who, saluting me gravely, said to me in the French Tongue, but in accent of a Foreigner: 'Adore, my Son; adore the most glorious and great God of the Sages; and let not thyself be puft up with Pride, that he sends to thee one of the Children of Wisdom, to constitute thee a Fellow of their Society and make thee a partaker of the wonders of his Omnipotency'."[3]

There is only one answer to those who, taking advantage of such works, laugh at Occultism. "Servitissimo" gives it himself in his own chaffing way in his introductory "Letter to my Lord," in the above-named work.

"I would have persuaded him" (the author) "to have changed the whole Frame of his work," he writes: "for this Drolling way of carrying it thus on does not to me seem proper to his Subject. These mysteries of the *Cabal* are serious Matters which many of my Friends do seriously study. . . . . the which are certainly most dangerous to jest with." [*Verbum satis est sapienti.*]

They are "dangerous," most undeniably. But since history began to record thoughts and facts, one-half of humanity has ever been sneering at the other half and ridiculing its most cherished beliefs. This, however, cannot change a fact into a fiction, nor can it destroy the sylphs, undines and gnomes, if there are any in Nature. For in league with salamanders the latter are more likely to destroy the unbelievers and damage insurance companies, notwithstanding that these believe still less in revengeful salamanders than in fires produced by accident and chance.

Theosophists believe in spirits no less than do Spiritualists, but to them they are dissimilar in their variety as are the feathered tribes of the air. There are bloodthirsty hawks and vampire-bats among these, as there are doves and nightingales. They believe in angels, for many have seen them:

> . . . . By the sick one's pillow
> Whose was the soft tone and the soundless tread?
> Where smitten hearts were drooping like the willow,
> They stood between the living and the dead.

But these were not the three-fold materializations of the modern

---

[3] *Sub-Mundanes, or the Elementaries of the Cabala*: "being the history of spirits; reprinted from the text of the Abbé de Villars, Physio-Astro-Mystic, wherein it is asserted that there are in existence on earth rational creatures besides man." (Robert H. Fryar, Bath, 1886.) P. 19.

medium. And if our doctrines were all torn to pieces by the "drolleries" of a de Villars that would not and could not interfere with the claim of the Occultists that their teachings are historical and scientific facts, whatever the garb in which they are presented to the profane. Since the first kings began reigning "by grace of God," countless buffoons appointed to amuse majesties and highnesses have passed away; and most of these graceless individuals had more wisdom at the bottom of their humps and at their finger's ends that all their royal masters put together had in their brainless pates. They alone had the inestimable privilege of speaking truths at the courts, and truths have always been laughed at.

This is a digression, but such works as that of the Comte de Gabalis have to be quietly explained and their true character shown, lest they should be made to serve as a sledge-hammer to pulverize those works which do not assume a humorous tone in speaking of mysterious, if not altogether sacred things, and which say what they have to say in direct language. And it is most positively maintained that there are more truths uttered in the witty railleries and gasconades of that satire—which is full of occult and actual facts—than most people, and Spiritualists especially, would care to learn. One single fact instanced and shown to exist now, at the present moment, among the Spiritualists, will be sufficient to prove that we are right.

It has been often said that white magic differs very little from the practices of sorcery except in its effects and results, good and bad motives being everything. The preliminary rules and conditions for entrance to Societies of Adepts are also identical in many points, both for those of the Right and the Left Path. Thus Gabalis says to the author: "The Sages will never admit you into their Society if you do not renounce from this very present a Thing which cannot stand in Competition with Wisdom. You must renounce all Carnal Commerce with women" (p. 27).

This is a *sine qua non* with all would-be mystics—Rosicrucians or Yogis, Europeans or Asiatics;[4] but it is also one with the Dugpas and Jadoos of Bhutan and India, as with the Voodoos and Nagals of New Orleans and Mexico—with an additional clause to it, however, in the statutes of the latter, and this is to have carnal commerce with male and

---

[4] We speak here of the well-known *ancient statutes* in the sorcery of the Asiatics and in the demonology of Europe. The witch had to renounce her husband; the wizard his marital rights over his legitimate human wife; as the Dugpa renounces to this day commerce with living women, and as the New Orleans Voodoo does when employed in the *exercise of his powers*. Every Kabalist knows this.

female djinns, elementals or demons—call them by whatever names you please.[5]

"I am making known nothing to you but the principles of the ancient *Cabal,*" explains de Gabalis to his pupil. And he informs him that the elementals (whom he calls elementaries, the inhabitants of the four elements, namely, the sylphs, undines, salamanders and gnomes) live many ages, but that their souls are not immortal (p. 29).

"In respect of Eternity . . . . they must finally resolve into nothing . . . . Our Fathers, the philosophers," goes on the *soi-disant* Rosicrucian, "speaking to God Face to Face, complained to him of the unhappiness of these People [the Elementals], and God, whose mercy is without bounds, revealed to them that it was not impossible to find out a Remedy for this Evil. He inspired them that by the same means as a man, by the Alliance which he contracted with God, has been made Partaker of the Divinity, the Sylphs, the Gnomes, the Nymphs, and the Salamanders, by the alliance which they might contract with man, might be made partakers of Immortality. So a she-nymph, or a sylphide, becomes Immortal and capable of the Blessing to which we aspire, when they shall be so happy as to be married to a Sage; a Gnome or a Sylph ceases to be mortal from the moment that he Espouses one of our Daughters" (pp. 31, 32).

Having explained that this intercourse has led to the error in former ages of attributing the fall of the angels to their love of the women on earth (the gandharvas of the Hindus, if you please), when in fact it was simply "The desire which all these Elementary Inhabitants have of Allying themselves to Men, as the only means to attain to the Immortality which they have not," the "sage" closes as follows: "No, no! our Sages have never erred so as to attribute the Fall of the first Angels to their Love of Women, no more than they have put Men under the Power of the Devil. . . . There was nothing criminal in all that. They were Sylphs which endeavoured to become Immortal. Their innocent pursuits, far enough from being able to scandalize the Philosophers, have appeared so just to us that we are all resolved by common consent utterly to Renounce Women and entirely to give ourselves to Immortalizing of the Nymphs and Sylphs" (p. 33).

---

[5] The Jewish Kabalist of Poland, when bent on revenge, calls the female spirit of Nergal to his help and to infuse into him power; the Mussulman sorcerer calls a female djini; a Russian Kaldoon a deceased witch (vedyma); the Chinese malefactor has a female houen in his house at his command; the above intercourse is said to give magic powers and a supernal force.

So with certain mediums, especially those of America, who boast of spiritual husbands and wives. We know personally several Spiritualists, men and women (and it is not those of Holland who will deny the fact) who escaped lunacy and death only by becoming Theosophists, and, by following our advice, got finally rid of their spiritual consorts of both sexes.

Shall we be told again that this is a calumny and an invention? Then let those outsiders who are inclined to see nought but a holy, or at any rate an innocent pastime in the nightly and daily intercourse with the so-called "spirits of the dead" watch some of the developments of Spiritualism in the United States. Let those who ridicule the beliefs of both Spiritualists and Theosophists—laughing at the warnings and explanations of the latter—let them, we say, explain, after analyzing the matter dispassionately, the mystery and the *rationale* of such facts as the existence in the minds of certain mediums and sensitives of the conviction of their actual marriage with male and female spirits. Explanations of lunacy and hallucination will never do when placed face to face with the undeniable facts of spirit-materializations. If there are "spirits" capable of drinking tea and wine, of eating apples and cakes, of kissing and touching the visitors at séance-rooms—all of which facts have been proved as well as the existence of these visitors themselves—why should not those same spirits perform matrimonial duties as well?

But who are these spirits, and what is their nature? Shall we be told that the spirits of Mme de Sévigné or of Delphine, two celebrated French authoresses, one of whom we abstain from naming out of regard to her surviving relatives, were the actual "spirits" of those two deceased ladies? That the latter felt a "spiritual affinity" for an idiotic, old and slovenly Canadian medium, and thus became "his happy wife," as he boasts publicly, the result of the union being a number of "spiritual" children? And who is this astral husband of a well-known lady medium whom the writer knows personally? Let the reader get every information he can about this last development of "spiritual" intercourse.[6] Let him think seriously over this, and then read the Comte de Gabalis' work, especially the Appendix to it; and then he perchance will be better able

[6] The answer given (p. 133) by an alleged devil to St. Anthony, respecting the corporeity of the incubi and succubæ would do as well now, perhaps: "The blessed St. Anthony" having inquired who he was, the little dwarf of the woods answered: "I am a mortal and one of the inhabitants of the Wilderness whom the gentile world under its varied delusions worships under the names Fauns, Satyrs, and Incubi," or "spirits of the dead," might have added this elemental, the vehicle of some elementary. This is a narrative of St. Hieronymus, who fully believed in it; and so do we, with certain amendments.

to appreciate the full gravity of the supposed chaff in the work in question, and to understand the value of the raillery in it. He will then see clearly the ghastly connection there is between the fauns, satyrs, and incubi of St. Hieronymus, the sylphs and nymphs of the Comte de Gabalis, the "elementaries" of the Kabalists, and all these poetical, spiritual "Lillies" of the "Harris Community," the astral "Napoleons" and the other departed Don Juans from the "Summer-Land," the "spiritual affinities from beyond the grave" of the modern world of mediums.

But all this still leaves open the question, Who are the spirits? For "where doctors disagree" there must be room for doubt. And besides such ominous facts as that spirits are divided in their views upon reincarnation, just as Spiritualists and Spiritists are, "Every man is not a proper champion for the truth nor fit to take up the gauntlet in the cause of verity," says Sir T. Browne. An eminent man of science, Mr. W. Crookes, gave once a very wise definition of Truth, by showing how necessary it is to draw a distinction between truth and accuracy. A person may be very truthful, he observed—that is to say, may be filled with the desire both to receive truth and to teach it, but unless that person have great natural powers of observation or have been trained by scientific study of some kind to observe, note, compare, and report accurately and in detail, he will not be able to give a trustworthy, accurate, and therefore true account of his experiences. His intentions may be honest, but if he have a spark of enthusiasm he will be always apt to proceed to generalizations which may be both false and dangerous. In short, as another eminent man of science, Sir John Herschell puts it: "The grand—and indeed the only character—of truth is its capability of enduring the test of universal experience and coming unchanged out of every possible form of fair discussion."

Now the question is not what either Spiritualists or Theosophists think personally of the nature of spirits and their degree of truthfulness; but what the "universal experience," demanded by Sir John Herschell, says. Spiritualism is a philosophy (if it be one at all, which so far we deny) of but yesterday; Occultism and the philosophy of the East, whether true absolutely or relatively, are teachings coming to us from an immense antiquity. And since both in the writings and traditions of the East, and in the numberless fragments and manuscripts left to us by the neo-platonic Theosophists, and so on *ad infinitum,* we find the same identical testimony as to the extremely various and often dangerous

nature of all these genii, demons, "gods," lares and "elementaries," now all confused into one heap under the name of "spirits," we cannot fail to recognize herein something "enduring the test of universal experience" and "coming unchanged out of every possible form" of observation and discussion.

Theosophists give only the product of an experience hoary with age; Spiritualists hold to their own views born some forty years ago, and based on their unflinching enthusiasm and emotionalism. But let any impartial, fair-minded witness to the doings of the "spirits" in America, one that is neither a Theosophist nor a Spiritualist, be asked: "What may be the difference between the vampire-bride from whom Apollonius of Tyana is said to have delivered a young friend of his, whom the nightly succuba was slowly killing, and the spirit-wives and husbands of our own day?" Surely none, would be the correct answer. Those who do not shudder at this hideous revival of mediæval demonology and witchcraft may, at any rate, understand the reason why of all the numerous enemies of Theosophy none are so bitter and so implacable as some of the Spiritualists of the Protestant and of the Spiritists of Roman Catholic countries.

*"Monstrum horrendum informe cui lumen ademptum"* is the fittest epithet to be applied to most of the "Lillies" and "Joes" of the "Spirit-World." But we do not mean at all—following in this the example of one-sided Spiritualists who are determined to believe in no other "spirits" than those of the "dear departed" ones—to maintain that, save nature-spirits or elementals, shells, and "gods" and genii, there are no spirits from the invisible realms, or no really holy and grand spirits, who communicate with mortals. For that is not so. What the Occultists and Kabbalists have said all along and what the Theosophists now repeat, is that holy Spirits will not visit promiscuous séance-rooms, nor will they intermarry with living men and women.

Belief in the existence of the invisible—but too often present—visitants from better and worse worlds than our own is too deeply rooted in men's hearts to be torn out easily by the cold hand of either materialism or science. Charges of superstition, coupled with ridicule, have at best but served to breed additional hypocrisy and social cant among the better classes. For there are few men, if any, at the bottom of whose souls belief in superhuman and supersensuous creatures does not lie latent, to awaken into existence at the first opportunity. No need to re-

peat the long string of names of eminent and scientific converts to the phenomena of Spiritualism and to the creed itself, since for many years the catalogue has been published weekly by some spiritualistic papers. Many are the men of science who, having abandoned with their nursery-pinafores belief in kings of elves and in fairy queens, and who would blush at being accused of believing in witchcraft, have fallen victims to the wiles of "Joes," "Daisies," and other spooks and "controls."

And once they have crossed the Rubicon they fear ridicule no longer. These scientists defend as desperately the reality of materialized and other spirits as if this were a mathematical law. Those soul-aspirations that seem innate in human nature and that slumber only to awaken to intensified activity: those yearnings to cross the boundary of matter that make many a hardened sceptic turn into a rabid believer at the first appearance of that which to him is undeniable proof—all these complex psychological phenomena of human temperament—have our modern physiologists found a key to them? Will the verdict be ever "*non compos mentis,*" or "victim to fraud and psychology"? When we say with regard to unbelievers that they are "a handful," the statement is no under-valuation, for it is not those who shout the loudest against "degrading superstitions," "the occult craze," and so on, who are the strongest in their scepticism. At the first opportunity they will be foremost among those who fall and surrender. And when one counts seriously the ever increasing millions of the Spiritualists, Occultists, and Mystics in Europe and America, one may well refuse to lament with Carrington over the "departure of the fairies." They are gone, says the poet:

> . . . . They are flown—
> Beautiful fictions of our fathers, woven
> In superstition's web when time was young,
> And fondly loved and cherished—they are flown
> Before the wand of Science!

We maintain that they have done nothing of the kind, and that on the contrary, it is these "fairies"—the beautiful far more than the hideous—who are seriously threatening under their new masks and names to disarm Science and break its "wand."

Belief in "spirits"—legitimate because resting on the authority of experiment and observation—vindicates at the same time another belief, also regarded as a supersition, namely polytheism. The latter is based upon a fact in Nature: spirits mistaken for Gods have been seen in every

age by men: hence belief in many and various Gods. Monotheism, on the other hand, rests upon a pure abstraction. Who ever saw God?—that God we mean, the Infinite and the Omnipotent, the one about whom monotheists talk so much? Polytheism—when once man claims the right of divine interference on his behalf—is logical and consistent with the philosophies of the East, all of which—whether pantheistic or deistic—proclaim the One to be an infinite abstraction, an absolute Something, which utterly transcends the conception of the finite. Surely such a creed is more philosophical than the religion whose theology, proclaiming God in one place as a mysterious and an incomprehensible Being, shows him at the same time so human and so petty a God as to concern himself with the breeches of his chosen people[7] while neglecting to say anything definite about the immortality of their souls or their survival after death!

Thus belief in a host and hosts of spiritual Entities dwelling on various planes and higher spheres in the universe, in conscious intracosmic Beings, in fact, is logical and reasonable, while belief in an extracosmic God is an absurdity. And if Jehovah—who was so jealous about his Jews and commanded that they should have no other God save himself—was generous enough to bestow Moses upon Pharaoh as the Egyptian monarch's Deity,[8] why should not "Pagans" be allowed the choice of their own Gods? When once we believe in the existence and survival of our Egos, we may also believe in Dhyan Chohans. As Hare has it: "Man is a fixed being, made up of a spiritual and of a fleshly body; the Angels are pure spirits, herein nearer to God, only that they are created and finite in all respects, whereas God is infinite and uncreated."

And if God is the latter, then God is not a "Being," but an incorporeal Principle not to be blasphemously anthropomorphized. The Angels, or the Dhyan Chohans, are the "Living Ones"; that Principle, the "Self-Existent," the eternal, and all-pervading Cause of all causes, is only the abstract noumenon of the "River of Life," whose ever-rolling waves create angels and men alike, the former being simply "men of a superior kind," as Young thought.

The masses of mankind are thus well justified in believing in a plu-

---

[7] "And thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover their nakedness, from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach" (*Exodus* xxviii, 42). God a linen-draper and a tailor!

[8] "I have made thee a God to Pharaoh." (*Exodus,* vii, 1).

rality of Gods; nor is it by calling them spirits, angels, and demons that Christians are less polytheistic than are their pagan brethren. The twenty or thirty millions of the now-existing Spiritualists and Spiritists minister to their dead as jealously as the modern Chinamen and the Hindus minister to their Houen,[9] Bhuts, and Pisachas; the Pagans, however, only keep them quiet from post-mortem mischief. On the other hand, we have demonstrated fully in the Proem to *The Secret Doctrine* that the worship of angels and spirits by the Roman Catholics and the Christians of the Oriental Churches, representing several hundred millions of men, women and children, who worship armies of Saints besides—is as idolatrous as any idol-worship in India and China. The only difference one can see is that the Pagans are sincere in calling their religion polytheism, whereas the Churches—in company with the Protestant Spiritualists, whether consciously or otherwise—put a mask on theirs by claiming for it the title of monotheistic Church.

There is a philosophy in dealing with the question of spirits in Indian "idolatry" that is conspicuously absent from the Western definitions of them. The Devas are, so to say, the embodied powers of states of matter, more refined than those with which we are familiar.[10] In the Vedas the Gods are mentioned as being eleven in number, where each one of the eleven stands as the representative of the class to which he belongs. Each of these classes again is subdivided into three, thus yielding the thirty-three classes of primary Gods, common alike to the Hindu and Buddhistic systems,[11] as may be seen on reference to Beale's *Catena of Chinese Buddhism*. Each one of these thirty-three, subdivided again, admits of further division almost indefinitely like the substantial monads of Leibnitz; a fact which is expressed by the number of the Gods being given by the Hindus as thirty-three crores ($33 \times 10{,}000{,}000$). The key to the esoteric significance of these Gods would enable modern physical science, and chemistry especially, to achieve a progress that they may not otherwise reach in a thousand years to come, as every God has a direct connection with, and a representative in, its bodily fabric, so to say, in invisible atoms and visible molecules—physical and chemical particles.[12]

[9] The Houen in China is "the second soul, or human vitality, the principle which animates the ghost," as explained by the missionaries from China—simply the astral. The Houen, however, is as distinct from the "Ancestors" as the Bhuts are from the Pitris in India.

[10] See *Secret Doctrine,* Book I, Part III: "Gods, Monads, and Atoms."

[11] See Chinese, Burmese, and Siamese Mythologies.

[12] See again "Gods, Monads, and Atoms."

Although these Gods are said to be "superior to men in some respects," it must not be concluded that the latent potencies of the human Spirit are at all inferior to those of the Devas. Their faculties are more expanded than those of ordinary man, but the conclusion of their evolution prescribes a limit to their expansion to which the human Spirit is not subjected. This fact has been symbolized in the *Mahabharata* by the single-handed victory of Arjuna, under the name of Nara (man), over the whole host of Devas and Devayonis (the lower Elementals). And we find reference to the same power in man in the *Bible,* for St. Paul distinctly says to his audience: "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" (I *Cor.* v. 3.), and speaks of the astral body of man (the soma psychikon) and the spiritual body (soma pneumatikon), which "hath not flesh and bones," but has still an ethereal form. An Adept, by putting himself under a special course of training and initiation, may attain the status of a Deva, but by such a course he is debarred from further progress along the true path. (See "Elixir of Life" in *Five Years of Theosophy.*) The story of Nahusa gives a glimpse of the truth as known to the Initiates.

A description of the orders of beings called Devas—whose variety is so great that it could not be attempted here—is given in some occult treatises. There are high Devas and lower ones, higher elementals and those far below man and even the animals. But all these have been or will be men, and the former will again be reborn on higher planets and in other Manvantaras. One thing may however be mentioned. The Pitris (or our "lunar ancestors"), and the communication of mortals with them, are several times mentioned by Spiritualists as an argument that Hindus do believe in, and even worship, "spirits." This is a great mistake. It is not the Pitris individually that were ever consulted, but their stored wisdom collectively, that wisdom being shown mystically and allegorically on the bright side of the moon. A few words may perhaps serve as valuable hints to Occultists and students.

What the Brahmanas invoke are not the "spirits" of the departed ancestors, the full significance of which name is shown in *The Secret Doctrine,* where the genesis of man is given. The most highly-developed human spirit will always declare, while leaving its tenement of clay: "*Nacha punaravarte*" ("I am not coming back"), and is thus placed beyond the reach of any living man. But to comprehend fully the nature of the "lunar ancestors" and their connection with the "moon" would

necessitate the revelation of occult secrets which are not intended for public hearing. Therefore no more can be given out beyond what is said here. One of the names of the moon is "Soma" in Sanskrit, and this is also the name, as is well known, of the mystic drink of the Brahmans, showing the connection between the two. A "soma-drinker" attains the power of placing himself in direct *rapport* with the bright side of the moon, and thus of deriving inspiration from the concentrated intellectual energy of the blessed ancestors. This concentration of energy—and the fact of the moon being a store-house of that energy—is the secret, the meaning of which must not be revealed, beyond the mere fact that it is continuously pouring upon the earth from the bright side of the orb.

This pours out in one stream (for the ignorant), but it is really of a dual nature: one giving life and wisdom, the other being lethal. He who can separate the former from the latter—as Kalahamsa separated milk from the water which was mixed with it, and thus showed great wisdom—will have his reward. The word "Pitri" does mean, no doubt, the "ancestor," but that which is invoked is the "lunar wisdom," as Manu calls it, not the "lunar ancestor." It is this wisdom that is invoked by Qu-ta-my, the Chaldean, in the *Nabathæan Agriculture,* he who wrote down "the revelation of the moon." But there is the other side to this. If most of the Brahmanical religious ceremonies are connected with the full moon, the dark ceremonials of the sorcerers take place at the new moon and at its last quarter. For similarly, when the lost human being, or sorcerer, attains the consummation of his depraved career, all the evil inspiration comes down upon him as a dark incubus of iniquity from the "dark side of the moon"—which is a *terra incognita* to science, but is a well-explored land to the Adept. The sorcerer, the Dugpa, who always performs his hellish rites on the day of the new moon—when the benignant influence of the Pitris is at its lowest ebb—crystallizes some of the satanic energy of his predecessors in evil, and turns it to his own vile uses; while the Brahmana, on the other hand, pursues a corresponding but benevolent course with the energy bequeathed to him by the Pitris.

This is the true Spiritualism, of which the heart and soul have been entirely missed by the modern Spiritualists. When the day of the full revelation comes it will be seen that the so-called "superstitions" of Brahmanism, and of the ancient Pagans in general, were merely natural and psychical sciences, veiled from the profane eyes of the ignorant multitudes, for fear of desecration and abuse, by allegorical and sym-

bolical disguises that modern science has failed to penetrate.

It follows from the foregoing that no Theosophist, whether Gentile or Christian, deist or pantheist, has ever believed in or helped to spread "degrading superstitions" any more than has any other philosophical or scientific society. If some Theosophists—most of them indeed—openly confess their belief in Dhyan Chohans (disembodied men from other preceding Manvantaras), in Pitris (our real, genuine ancestors), and in the hosts of other spirits—mundane, sub-mundane, and supra-mundane—they do no worse than the whole Christian world did, does, and will do. In this they are far more honourable than those who hide that belief and keep it *sub rosa.* The only difference between the spirits of other societies, sects and bodies, and ours lies in their names and in dogmatic assertions with regard to their natures. In those whom the millions of Spiritualists call the "spirits of the dead," and in whom the Roman Catholic Church sees the devils of the host of Satan, we see neither. We call them Dhyan Chohans, Devas, Pitris, Elementals, high and low, and know them as the "Gods" of the Gentiles—imperfect at times, never wholly so. Each order has its name, its place, its functions assigned to it in Nature, and each host is the complement and crown of its own particular sphere, as man is the complement and crown of his own globes; hence all are a natural and logical necessity in Kosmos.

---

## ALL LIFE A "SECRET"

The deeper we look into nature, the more we recognize that it is full of life, and the more profoundly we know that all life is a secret and that we are united with all life that is in nature. Man can no longer live his life for himself alone. We realize that all life is valuable and that we are united to all this life. From this knowledge comes our spiritual relationship to the universe.

—ALBERT SCHWEITZER

# H.P.B. WAS NOT DESERTED BY MASTERS

THERE are certain things connected with the personality of the great leader which have to be referred to and explained every now and again even in a Society whose effort is as much as possible to avoid the discussion of personalities. Sometimes they are disagreeable, especially when, as in the present instance, some other persons have to be brought in. And when the great leader is H. P. Blavatsky, a whole host of principles and postulates as to certain laws of nature cluster round her name. For not only was she one who brought to us from the wiser brothers of the human family a consistent philosophy of the solar system, but in herself she illustrated practically the existence of the supersensuous world and of the powers of the inner and astral man. Hence any theory or assertion touching on her relations with the unseen and with the Masters she spoke for inevitably opens up the discussion of some law or principle. This of course would not be the case if we were dealing with a mere ordinary person.

Many things were said about H.P.B. in her lifetime by those who tried to understand her, some of them being silly and some positively pernicious. The most pernicious was that made by Mr. A. P. Sinnett in London in the lifetime of H.P.B., and before the writing of *The Secret Doctrine,* that she was deserted by the Masters and was the prey of elementals and elemental forces. He was courageous about it, for he said it to her face, just as he had often told her he thought she was a fraud in other directions.

This theory was far-reaching, as can be seen at a glance. For if true, then anything she might say as from the Masters which did not agree with the opinion of the one addressed could be disposed of as being only the vaporing of some elementals. And that very use was made of it. It was not discussed only in the charmed seclusion of the London Lodge, but was talked of by nearly all of the many disciples and would-be disciples crowding around H.P.B. It has left its mark even unto this day. And when the total disagreement arose between H.P.B. and Mr. Sinnett as to the relation of Mars and Mercury to this earth, and as to the metaphysical character of the universe—H.P.B. having produced an explanation from the Master—then the pernicious theory and others like it

---

NOTE.—This article by Mr. Judge was first published in the *Path* for April, 1896, the month after his death, and was last reprinted in THEOSOPHY for May, 1950.

were brought forward to show she was wrong, did not have word from the Master, and that Mr. Sinnett's narrow and materialistic views of the Master's statement—which had been made before the alleged desertion and elemental possession—were the correct ones. The dispute is imbedded in *The Secret Doctrine.* The whole philosophy hangs upon it. The disagreement came about because Mr. Sinnett held that his view of one of the letters from the Master received in India—through the hands of H.P.B.—was the correct view, whereas she said it was not. He kept rigidly to his position, and she asked the Master for further explanation. When this was received by her and shown to Mr. Sinnett he denied its authenticity, and then the desertion theory would explain the rest. He seemed to forget that she was the channel and he was not.

Although wide publicity was not given to the charge then, it was fully discussed by the many visitors to both camps, and its effect remains to this day among those who of late have turned in private against H.P.B. Among themselves they explain her away very easily, and in public they oppose those who adhere firmly to her memory, her honor, and the truth of her statements about the Masters and their communications to her. They think that by dragging her down to the mediocre level on which they stand they may pretend to understand her, and look wise as they tell when she was and when she was not obsessed. This effort will, of course, be unsuccessful; and some will think the matter need not be brought forward. There are many reasons why it should be discussed and left no longer as a secret poison: because it leads to a negation of brotherhood; to an upholding of ingratitude, one of the blackest crimes; and, if believed, will inevitably lead to the destruction of the great philosophy broadly outlined by the Masters through H.P.B.

If, as claimed by Mr. Sinnett, H.P.B. was deserted by the Masters after they had used her for many years as their agent and channel of communication, such desertion would be evidence of unimaginable disloyalty on their part, utterly opposed to their principles as stated by themselves. For when the advisability of similar desertion was in Mr. Sinnett's mind many years before, when he did not approve of H.P.B.'s methods of conducting the movement in India, Master K.H. emphatically wrote him that "ingratitude is not among our vices," asking him if he would consider it just, "supposing you were thus to come," as H.P.B. did, and were to "abandon all for truth; to toil wearily for years up the hard, steep road, not daunted by obstacles, firm under every temptation;

were to faithfully keep within your heart the secrets entrusted to you as a trial; had worked with all your energies and unselfishly to spread the truth and provoke men to correct thinking and a correct life—would you consider it just, if, after all your efforts," you were to be treated as you propose Mdme. Blavatsky should be treated? But this warning evidently produced only a transient effect, for in a few years' time, as stated, Mr. Sinnett came to the conclusion that his suggestion had been acted upon to an even greater extent than he had originally intended. At first he had only wished that H.P.B. should be put on one side as channel between himself and the Master, leaving a newly organized T.S. to his own management under those conditions; but he afterwards thought that H.P.B. had been put on one side as a channel of any sort so far as the Masters were concerned. This wholesale later desertion would mean that in the meantime Master K.H. had entirely changed in character and had become capable of gross ingratitude, which is absurd. Masters are above all things loyal to those who serve them and who sacrifice health, position and their entire lives to the work which is the Master's; and H.P.B. did all this and more, as the Master wrote. To take the other view and imagine that after years of such service as is described in the above quotation, H.P.B. was left to be figuratively devoured by elementals, would prove Masters to be merely monsters of selfishness, using a tool not made of iron but of a wonderful human heart and soul, and throwing this tool away without protection the moment they had done with it.

And how about the members and more faithful disciples who were left in ignorance of this alleged desertion? Would it have been loyal to them? They had been taught for years to look with respect upon H.P.B. and the teachings she gave out, and to regard her as the Masters' channel. They received no warning that the plan Mr. Sinnett had for so long carried in his mind could possibly be carried out, but on the contrary often received personally from the Masters endorsements of H.P.B.'s actions and teachings. Those who harbored constant doubts of her veracity were reproved; and yet it would seem for no other apparent reason than a necessary correction by her of Mr. Sinnett's wrong interpretation of earlier teachings she was abandoned by her old teachers and friends who had spent years in training her for just this work!

So the whole far-fetched supposition is alike contrary to brotherhood and to occultism. It violates every law of true ethics and of the Lodge,

and to crown its absurdity would make *The Secret Doctrine* in large measure the work of elementals. Deserted before the explanation of Mr. Sinnett's mistakes appeared in that book, H.P.B. was obsessed to some advantage, it may be thought! But in fact a great depth of ignorance is shown by those who assert that she was deserted and who add that elementals controlled her, doing the work for her. They do not know the limitations of the elemental: an elemental can only copy what already exists, cannot originate or invent, can only carry out the exact impulse or order given, which if incomplete will cause the result to be similarly incomplete, and will not start work unless pushed on by a human mind and will. In no case is this elemental supposition tenable.

The ignorance shown on this point is an example of the mental standing of most of H.P.B.'s critics. Materialists in their bias, they were unable to understand her teachings, methods or character, and after badly assimilating and materializing the ideas they got originally from her, they proceeded to apply the result to an explanation of everything about her that they could not understand, as if they were fitting together the wooden blocks of several different puzzles. But if in spite of all reason this view of desertion were to be accepted, it would certainly lead in the end, as I have said, to the destruction of the Theosophical philosophy. Its indirect effect would be as detrimental as the direct effect of degrading the ideal of Masters. This is clearly shown in *The Secret Doctrine*.

After pointing out in her "Introductory" to *The Secret Doctrine* (p. xviii) the preliminary mistake made by the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* in claiming that "two years ago (*i.e.*, 1883) neither I nor any other European living knew the alphabet of the Science, here for the first time put into scientific shape," when as a matter of fact not only H.P.B. had known all that and much more years before, but two other Europeans and an American as well;—she proceeds to give the Master's own explanation of his earlier letters in regard to the Earth Chain of Globes and the relation of Mars and Mercury thereto (vol. I, pp. 160-170, o.e.). Mr. Sinnett himself confesses that he had "an untrained mind" in Occultism when he received the letters through H.P.B. on which *Esoteric Buddhism* was based. He had a better knowledge of modern astronomical speculations than of the occult doctrines, and so it was not to be wondered at, as H.P.B. remarks, that he formed a materialistic view of a metaphysical subject. But these are the Master's own words in reply to an application from H.P.B. for an explanation of what she well knew

was a mistake on Mr. Sinnett's part—the inclusion of Mars and Mercury as globes of the Earth Chain:

"Both (Mars and Mercury) are septenary chains, as independent of the earth's sidereal lords and superiors as you are independent of the principles of Daumling." "Unless less trouble is taken to reconcile the irreconcilable—that is to say, the metaphysical and spiritual sciences with physical or natural philosophy, 'natural' being a synonym to them (men of science) of that matter which falls under the perception of their corporeal senses—no progress can be really achieved. Our Globe, as taught from the first, is at the bottom of the arc of descent, where the matter of our perceptions exhibits itself in its grossest form. * * * Hence it only stands to reason that the globes which overshadow our Earth must be on different and superior planes. In short, as globes, they are in *co-adunition* but not *in consubstantiality with our Earth,* and thus pertain to quite another state of consciousness."

Unless this be accepted as the correct explanation, the entire philosophy becomes materialistic and contradictory, analogy ceases to be of any value, and both the base and superstructure of Theosophy must be swept away as useless rubbish. But there is no fear of this, for the Master's explanation will continue to be accepted by the large majority of Theosophists.

And as to H.P.B. personally, these words might possibly be remembered with advantage: "Masters say that Nature's laws have set apart woe for those who spit back in the face of their teacher, for those who try to belittle her work and make her out to be part good and part fraud; those who have started on the path through her must not try to belittle her work and aim. They do not ask for slavish idolatry of a person, but loyalty is required. They say that the Ego of that body she uses was and is a great and brave servant of the Lodge, sent to the West for a mission with full knowledge of the insult and obloquy to be surely heaped upon that devoted head; and they add: 'Those who cannot understand her had best not try to explain her; those who do not find themselves strong enough for the task she outlined from the very first had best not attempt it'."

# QUESTION—AND COMMENT

*A PHRASE occuring in the Declaration of ULT has probably often led to a kind of quizzical questioning in the minds of inquirers: "It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization." Might this sentence not easily be taken to be presumptuous on the ground that Theosophists assume a dubious privilege in labeling all good and great men as "Theosophists," claiming a sort of proprietary kinship with them?*

In the first place, it is clear from a historical standpoint that this phrasing, as the rest of the phrasing of the Declaration of ULT, was originally addressed "to all open-minded *Theosophists*"—at a time when rival organizations and partisan claimants to special authority were all presumably representing "true" Theosophy. The original associates of ULT were determined to avoid the trap of sectarianism, and felt that, among Theosophists, one should welcome those of any and all backgrounds on the basis of their simple profession to serve the cause of Humanity "without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization." It is true, however, that sectarianism on the part of various Theosophical groups has noticeably diminished, so that a secondary question is therefore legitimate—as to whether the quoted phrasing is sufficiently clear to those who begin their Theosophical studies for the first time under the auspices of ULT.

Underlying the obvious reference of the phrase in question to the need for erasing ideas of "distinction" among Theosophists, there may be seen a broad metaphysical assumption that all men, simply because they *are* men, are to some degree "Theosophists"—that is, a vision of the need for transcendence of personal egocentricity is glimpsed at times by every person. Theosophy is represented as the collectivity of that sort of wisdom which aids in fulfillment of the vision, an enlargement of perspective which helps man to become truly himself by reaching beyond selfishness. The great teachers of mankind, whatever the doctrines they profess, are the symbols of "service to Humanity"; and the greater the teacher, the more clearly does he reach beyond "distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization."

The philosophical assumption of an identity of all mankind in terms

of spiritual potential is a derivative, one might say, of the metaphysical implications of the First Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine*. In H. P. Blavatsky's article "Our Three Objects," which appeared in *Lucifer* in 1889, the writer explains the relationship between Theosophical work directed towards the formation of a nucleus of Universal Brotherhood and "Occultism":

> Though but a minority of our members are mystically inclined, yet, in point of fact, the key to all our successes as above enumerated is in our recognition of the fact of the Higher Self—colourless, cosmopolitan, unsectarian, sexless, unworldly, altruistic—and the doing of our work on that basis.
>
> Social differentiations, the result of physical evolutions and material environment, breed race hatreds and sectarian and social antipathies that are insurmountable if attacked from the outside. But, since human nature is ever identical, all men are alike open to influences which centre upon the human "heart," and appeal to the human intuition; and as there is but one Absolute Truth, and this is the soul and life of all human creeds, it is possible to effect a reciprocal alliance for the research of and dissemination of that basic Truth. We know that a comprehensive term for that Eternal Verity is the "Secret Doctrine."

These brief passages suggest some subtle distinctions between "service of humanity" based on the essence of Theosophical philosophy and more familiar humanitarian or altruistic works. "Service of humanity" is conventionally identified with *benevolence,* professional or otherwise —perhaps connected with the same sort of sentiment which has long been responsible for the sending of Christian missionaries to the far corners of the earth. But Theosophical *altruism* may be thought to have two other connotations. The first is suggested by the derivation of the word from the French expression, *le bien d'autrui,* which means simply, according to Joseph Shipley's *Dictionary of Word Origins,* "the right of another." The philosopher Comte coined the noun *altruisme* from this phrase, as a condition of mind which is opposed to egoism. Comte assumed that what is good for another man is principally that which comes from granting him his full rights, and we find a similar emphasis by H.P.B. in her *Key to Theosophy.* She states that "altruism is an integral part of self-development," but adds that "we have to discriminate"— "Theosophy teaches self-abnegation, but does not teach rash and useless self-sacrifice, nor does it justify fanaticism." In description of "the rights of another," she employs the context of that which is "due to hu-

manity at large," which includes "full recognition of equal rights and privileges for all, and without distinction of race, colour, social position, or birth." Such due is *not* given "when there is the slightest invasion of another's right—be that other a man or a nation; when there is any failure to show him the same justice, kindness, consideration or mercy which we desire for ourselves."

The other dimension of Theosophical altruism, or "service of humanity," is more difficult to discuss, because it involves a quality of heart that reaches beyond such specific considerations as those mentioned and beyond sentiment—the quality of compassion. And, as *The Voice of the Silence* reminds us, "compassion is no attribute." Instead, compassion is "the Law of Laws," and, as Gandhi once put it, it should be "the law of our species" as "violence is the law of the brute." The Theosophist, then, is one who encourages himself to recognize the presence of this supreme capacity of egoic perception—latent in all men and active in those who, regardless of creed or condition, have responded selflessly.

* * *

The following suggestions from a subscriber are in the form of a helpful "comment upon a comment" in regard to discussion of a question which appeared in THEOSOPHY for March. The question had to do with the possible interpretation of fatalism which might be derived from a statement in *Isis Unveiled,* dealing with the astral light—where H.P.B. wrote that "the future exists in the astral light in embryo," and "while man is free to act as he pleases, the manner in which he *will* act was foreknown from all time." To the suggestion made by the editors of THEOSOPHY our correspondent adds the following:

> I believe a little can be added on the score of literary history. The Kabalistic quotation is only half a statement pertaining to the state of the personality prior to physical birth, and in itself seems to be something of a distortion from fundamental philosophy. It is a serious mistake to consider that everything H.P.B. quoted represented her own view and/or that of the Mahatmas. She often used rather anomalous or distorted quotations to show general trends of past thought rather than tenets in detail. The Kabala is badly tainted with the personal god idea—at least in the form in which it is available to the public. That idea implicitly carries with it both predestination and limitless prior knowledge, both of which are denied by the Mahatmas.
>
> Both *Isis* and the *S.D.* contain a number of half-statements which have to be put together to get the whole truth, probably intentionally so, as the object of the teachings was at least as much to teach people

> to think as it was to convey definite tenets. Your quotation from *S.D.* 1, 639 seems to be in that class. It applies to the local "preordination" of the events which will happen to the personality as the result of its own choices in the past; and even within that field shows a wide range of choice. It depends entirely on the difference between the Egoic and personal point of view. To the uninformed personality *everything* is predestination, merely because it does not see the line of causation—which blindness the post-mortem vision cures temporarily.

The central suggestion here is of enduring significance for the Theosophical student. It is evident that H.P.B. spoke to those who realized she was largely providing them with *material with which to work,* rather than with revelations or doctrinal finality. Broad enlightenment on many of the abstruse or difficult problems treated in *The Secret Doctrine* comes only after individual discovery, when many related statements have been considered together.

---

## Our Life Upon Earth

To the Buddhist the Cosmos is not divine at all—quite the reverse. It is Karma, it is the creation of thoughts and acts of error. Likewise it is an illusion. Our life upon earth is a state of sleep. Yet we do not sleep utterly. There are gleams in our darkness—auroral wakenings of Love and Pity and Sympathy and Magnanimity: these are selfless and true, these are eternal and divine, these are the Four Infinite Feelings in whose after-glow all forms and illusions will vanish like mists in the light of the sun. But, except in so far as we wake to these feelings, we are dreamers indeed, moaning unaided in darkness, tortured by shadowy horror. All of us dream; none are fully awake; and many, who pass for the wise of the world, know even less of the truth than my dog that howls in the night.

—Lafcadio Hearn

# PROEM

## IV

MANIFESTING, yet *un*manifested: This self-contradictory statement presents the major paradox in the Archaic symbolism of the Point—"the most important of all the geometrical figures used in metaphysical emblematology"—and demands pondering until the truth it contains is comprehended, for the evolution of the Universe, recorded in symbols, begins with the "point."

Metaphysical ideas are often obscured by words. Words serve their proper function when they invite the mind to look beyond the apparent meaning—bringing *into exercise* the present perceptive powers which are strengthened as they penetrate the exterior form of the word and discern the sometimes-subtle idea therein with its ramification of meanings and correspondences.

Words reveal and at the same time conceal. A richness of revelation or a profuseness of words may distract the mind—leading it to rest upon some luminous detail while it remains blind to the essential nature of the thing or being which is the object of search. Herein is the profound value of the symbolism of the Ancients. The plane of abstraction—of abstract Archaic symbols—is inviolate, eternally. The mind that misconceives the meaning of a symbol does violence to itself; the symbol remains unprofaned. However, there is THAT which has neither symbol nor name to identify it: the UNNAMEABLE.

> The Point is the First Cause, but THAT from which it emanates, or of which, it is the expression, the Logos, is passed over in silence. (*S.D.* I, 426.)

It is an interesting commentary on the mind of the time that *The Secret Doctrine,* which was written "for the instruction of students of Occultism and not for the benefit of philologists," should need to occupy so many pages with the clarification of the God-idea—for which the Point is in one sense a symbol—and it is a revealing commentary on human nature that H. P. Blavatsky, after some fourteen years of work with the Theosophical Society, should say: "I have in vain endeavoured to impart to Theosophists at large the great axiomatic truth that the only eternal and living reality is that which the Hindus call Paramatma or Parabrahma. This is the one ever-existing Root Essence, immutable

and unknowable to our physical senses, but manifest and clearly perceptible to our spiritual natures. Once imbued with that basic idea and the further conception that if it is omnipresent, universal, and eternal, like abstract Space itself, we must have emanated from it and must, some day, return to it, and all the rest becomes easy."

Some words of Coleridge, the poet-philosopher, are interesting and relevant on this point:

> It is the essential mark of the true philosopher to rest satisfied with no imperfect light, as long as the impossibility of attaining a fuller knowledge has not been demonstrated. . . . Philosophy can not be intelligible to all, even of the most learned and cultivated classes. A system, the first principle of which it is to render the mind intuitive of the spiritual in man (*i.e.* of that which lies *on the other side* of our natural consciousness), must needs have a great obscurity for those who have never disciplined and strengthened this ulterior consciousness. . . . On the IMMEDIATE, which dwells in every man, and on the original intuition, or absolute affirmation of it (which is likewise in every man, but does not in every man rise into consciousness), all the *certainty* of our knowledge depends; and this becomes intelligible to no man by the ministry of mere words from without.

And the insistent note of the "*Upanishads,* called the holy *Bhagavad-Gita,*" is that a man is "fitted to be the Supreme Being," not by much study of the Vedas—nor by much hearing or speaking of the Scriptures, nor by alms-giving nor by sacrificial rites nor by deeds—but by the discipline "in all works" of an unfettered mind and subdued heart. Therefore the mind, accustomed by training or habit to looking "without and around" or at best to the invisible workings of *objective* Nature, is directed in the philosophy of the Ancients to look *within* and *beyond* to the *only eternal and living reality*—Paramatma or Parabrahm.

Para, in the truest sense, means "beyond." According to the *Theosophical Glossary*: PARA (Sk.) means "infinite" and "supreme" in philosophy—the final limit. *Param* is the end and goal of existence. *Parama* is the "one Supreme;" *The Secret Doctrine* says, that one "supreme" Parama, called Guhya or "secret," and Sarvatma, the "Super-Soul." *Parapara* is the boundary of boundaries. This "beyond-ness" identifies with the unlimiting phrases of the First Fundamental Proposition:

> An Omnipresent, Eternal, Boundless, and Immutable PRINCIPLE on which all speculation is impossible, since it transcends the power of human conception . . . This Infinite and Eternal Cause is the rootless

> root of "all that was, is, or ever shall be." It is devoid of attributes and is essentially without any relation to manifested, finite Being. It is "Be-ness" rather than Being (in Sanskrit, *Sat*).

Sat, says H. P. Blavatsky, is an "untranslateable" term, and she adds: "One feels a serious doubt whether, with all its intellectual acuteness, our age is destined to discover in each Western nation even one solitary *uninitiated* scholar or philosopher capable of fully comprehending the spirit of archaic philosophy. Nor can one be expected to do so before the real meaning of these terms, the *Alpha* and *Omega* of Eastern esotericism, the words *Sat* and *Asat*—so freely used in the Rig-Veda, and elsewhere—is thoroughly assimilated. Without this key to the Aryan Wisdom, the Cosmogony of the Rishis and the Arhats is in danger of remaining a dead letter to the average Orientalist. *Asat* is not merely the negation of *Sat,* nor is it the 'not yet existing'; for *Sat* is in itself neither the 'existent,' nor 'being.' SAT is the immutable, the ever present, changeless and eternal root, from and through which all proceeds. But it is far more than the potential force in the seed, which propels onward the process of development, or what is now called evolution. It is the ever becoming, though the never manifesting. *Sat* is born from *Asat,* and ASAT is begotten by *Sat;* the perpetual motion in a circle, truly; yet a circle that can be squared only at the supreme Initiation, at the threshold of Paranirvana." (*S.D.* II, 449-50.)

There is no equivalent of *para* in the English language. The prefix in the word *meta*physics and in the word *para*psychology cannot approximate its meaning because of the materialistic or mistaken and changing views of the "natural Universe" and the erroneous and misleading regard of psychology as the science of mind, instead of Soul. This obstacle to understanding was remarked upon by Wm. Q. Judge in *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* (p. 3):

> Before the Upanishads can be properly rendered, the Indian psychological system must be understood; and even when its existence is admitted, the English speaking person will meet the great difficulty arising from an absence of words in that language which correspond to the ideas so frequently found in the Sanskrit. Thus we have to wait until a new set of words have been born to express the new ideas not yet existing in the civilization of the West.

The opening pages of the Proem seem primarily to prepare the mind of the reader to understand abstractions. The symbolism of the Point

belongs to the *indescribable* stage of the Second Stanza of Dzyan, necessarily presented in allegorical phrases—their meaning "left to the intuition and the higher faculties of the reader to grasp." The first reference to that symbol is in these words: "The point in the hitherto immaculate Disk, Space and Eternity in Pralaya, denotes the dawn of differentiation." The words "Space and Eternity in Pralaya"—what do they *reveal?* They indicate that Space and Time—inseparable in manifestation—are indistinguishable in Pralaya. The "dawn" of differentiation—to find a simile—is, perhaps, like the *secret, hidden promise of Spring* already present in the cold and the dark of Winter solstice—imperceptible, unsuspected. And what do those words *conceal?* They leave undisclosed the implicit *dynamic* of differentiation, inherent in the Point, indissolubly involved in every phase and stage of emerging objectivity, and constituting the essence of every manifested thing and being. "Deity is in every point of the Universe." The Universe and the Deity which informs it are "unthinkable" apart from each other.

The first reference to the word Deity, in the Proem, is the *unrevealed* Deity "recognized and considered under its only philosophical aspect—universal motion, the thrill of the creative Breath in Nature." There is no conceptual basis in Occultism for a personal God as creator of the Universe.

Paradox, though, is perpetually present. "Parabrahm," explains the Mandukya Upanishad, "is that which is supreme, and not supreme," IT is "Supreme" as *CAUSE,* not supreme as effect. And H. P. Blavatsky says, *S.D.* I, 54:

> The idea that things can cease to exist and still BE, is a fundamental one in Eastern psychology. Under this apparent contradiction in terms, there rests a fact in Nature to realize which in the mind, rather than to argue about words, is the important thing.

TO BE, philosophically considered, is ultimate Reality. To "become" is to *come* to *be* in the course of time—inseparability of Space and Time. TO BE is an absolute term; to *become* is relative, implying relationships of time and place and circumstance—cause and effect. The caterpillar becomes a butterfly—a fascinating phenomenon to behold and to comprehend, and which might, conceivably, capture the energies of the mind. On the other hand it may serve as symbol—as could the whole of the manifested world—and *keep awake* the aroused spiritual intuition. To quote again from Coleridge:

> They, and they only, can acquire the philosophic imagination, the sacred power of self-intuition, who within themselves can interpret and understand the symbol that the wings of the air-sylph are forming within the skin of the caterpillar; those only, who feel in their own spirits the same instinct, which impels the chrysalis of the horned fly to leave room in its *involucrum* for *antennae* yet to come. They know and feel, that the potential works in them, even as the actual works on them! In short, all the organs of sense are framed for a corresponding world of sense; and we have it. All the organs of spirit are framed for a correspondent world of spirit; though the latter are not developed in all alike. But they exist in all, and their first appearance discloses itself in the moral being.

Using the Law of Analogy as infallible guide and recognizing the Law of Periodicity as the unerring rule, Man will learn to be enlightened instead of bewildered by "the mighty magic of Prakriti" because the LAW for the birth, growth, and decay of everything in Kosmos, from the Sun to the glow-worm in the grass, is ONE.

. . . . . .

The ancients contrived to throw a thick veil over the nucleus of truth concealed by the symbol, but they ever tried to preserve the latter as a record for future generations, sufficiently transparent to allow their wise men to discern that truth behind the fabulous form of the glyph or allegory.

---

## "THE UNMEDIATED WHOLE"

Man alone, during his brief existence on this earth, is free to examine, to know, to criticize, and to create. In this freedom lies his superiority over the forces that pervade his outward life. He is that unique organism in terms of matter and energy, space and time, which is urged to conscious purpose. Reason is his characteristic and indistinguishing principle. But man is only man—and free—when he considers himself as a total being in whom "the unmediated whole of feeling and thought" is not severed and who impugns any form of atomization as artificial, mischievous, and predatory.

—RUTH NANDA ANSHEN

# YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

*MOST young people, when the time comes for them to choose their life's work, employ one or several criteria for making that choice. For example they may insist that what they do be artistically creative, or that it afford economic security, or that it be of some practical help to mankind. The young theosophist, if he is sincere, would probably add another criterion by insisting that what he does be of help to the Theosophical Movement. However, if a person is to use the latter criterion, he must first decide what it means. Does it mean that he must confine himself to the physical preservation of U.L.T.? or would it permit him to spend his life in direct practical help to others, for example, in the role of psychologist? or again, can one say that he is helping on the Theosophical Movement simply if he follows any natural "gift" or penchant which he may have?*

This is one of many questions of which one may (hopefully) say that it will never receive a definite answer in any Theosophical publication. It is not the business of Theosophy to hand out dogmas and pre-fabricated solutions to the complex and often ambiguous questions of life; but rather to present certain principles upon which a person may base his own conclusions as to the best course of action in any particular circumstance. Accordingly, all one may hope to do in this short space is to elaborate on the question itself, and to try to discover some of the principles through which intelligent answers may be derived.

One such principle is that of spiritual evolution, which may truly be said to be the purpose of Life. It is probably safe to assume that one can do no better than choose an occupation that helps to further, or at least does not hinder, the spiritual process. However, one seriously trying to attain true knowledge might easily argue that any occupation at all is a compromise, and that mere physical actions of whatever kind can only dull the mind and retard the soul in its journey. To such people, the question becomes simply, "Which occupation is the *least destructive* of spiritual progress?"

On examination, however, we discover something of a fallacy in this line of reasoning. The nature of that fallacy is pointedly suggested in the statement by Mr. Judge, that "it is not so much the study of ourselves

as the thought for others that opens the door." The thought for others, it seems clear, is not affected by one's occupation, and therefore cannot be impaired by it. One's love for his fellow man cannot be contingent upon the manner in which he makes his living. Indeed, from one point of view, it does not matter what one does, for so long as one seeks the approval of others, performing acts with the view to winning (or in a sense, buying) new friends, or helps others not from love but from loneliness or guilt, the most "philanthropic" occupations are devoid of any moral weight or lasting value.

But one cannot merit others' love if one's every act is subconsciously colored by the search for that love. A clear statement of this simple and usually ignored fact is found in the Analects of Confucius: "The Master said, A gentleman is distressed by his own lack of capacity; he is never distressed at the failure of others to recognize his merits."

The above considerations, instead of answering the question, serve only to make it more difficult, for if a man's occupation has no influence upon his "thought for others," and if it is this quality of thoughtfulness which makes spiritual progress possible, might not one be led to conclude that all occupations are in a very real sense meaningless? Perhaps we may find that this line of reasoning too, is fallacious, for although one's love for others does not depend upon the way he makes his living, nevertheless, the way he makes his living may very well be determined by his love for his fellows. That love will make him choose an occupation in which he is best able to bring his "thought for others" into positive action, and help all men to further their spiritual progress.

What that occupation is would seem to be dependent upon the individual's particular aptitudes and inclinations. It would be as useless as it is impossible to try to circumscribe certain areas as those in which one may serve his fellow man. As an individual, each man has the right and duty to choose his own criteria and come to his own decision as to what he should do with his life.

# THE SAVIOUR—INTUITION

WHEN thou prayest, *enter into thy closet,* and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father in secret," says the Nazarene, the pupil of the Essenes. Prayer opens the spiritual sight of man, for prayer is desire, and desire develops WILL; the magnetic emanations proceeding from the body at every effort—whether mental or physical—produce self-magnetization and ecstasy.

That which supports the faith of man in God and a spiritual life to come is *intuition;* the divine outcome of the inner-self, which defies the mummeries of the Roman Catholic priest and his ridiculous idols; the thousand and one ceremonies of the Brahman and his idols; and the jeremiads of the Protestant preacher, and desolate and arid creed, with no idols, but a boundless hell and damnation hooked on at the end. Were it not for this intuition, undying though often wavering because so clogged with matter, human life would be a parody and humanity a fraud. This ineradicable feeling of a presence of some one *outside* and *inside* ourselves is one that no dogmatic contradictions nor external forms of worship can destroy in humanity, let scientists and clergy do what they may.

To accept the Bible as a "revelation" and nail belief to a literal translation, is worse than absurdity—it is a blasphemy against the Divine majesty of the "Unseen." If we had to judge of the Deity, and the world of spirits by its human interpreters, now that philology proceeds with giant-strides on the fields of comparative religions, belief in God and the soul's immortality could not withstand the attacks of *reason* for one century more. Modern science, by neglecting to unriddle the true sense of the Bible, and by allowing the whole of Christendom to go on believing in the dead letter of the Jewish theology, tacitly constitutes herself the confederate of the fanatical clergy. She has no right to ridicule the records of a people who never wrote them with the idea that they would receive such strange interpretations at the hands of an inimical religion. That their holiest texts should be turned against them and that the dead men's bones could have smothered the spirit of truth, is the saddest feature of Christianity!

That which the student will do well to remember is that, with every

---

NOTE.—Collated from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky.

people except the Christian nations, the Devil is to this day no worse an entity than the opposite aspect in the dual nature of the so-called Creator. This is only natural. One cannot claim God as the synthesis of the whole Universe, as Omnipresent and Omniscient and Infinite, and then divorce him from evil. As there is far more evil than good in the world, it follows on logical grounds that either God must include evil, or stand as the direct cause of it, or else surrender his claims to absoluteness. The ancients understood this so well that their philosophers—now followed by the Kabalists—defined evil as the lining of God or Good: *Demon est Deus inversus* being a very old adage.

Indeed, evil is but an antagonizing blind force in nature; it is *reaction, opposition,* and *contrast,*—evil for some, good for others. There is no *malum in se*: only the shadow of light, without which light could have no existence, even in our perceptions. If evil disappeared, good would disappear along with it from Earth. The "Old Dragon" was pure spirit before he became matter, *passive* before he became *active.* In the Syro-Chaldean magic both Ophis and Ophiomorphis are joined in the Zodiac, at the sign of the Androgyne *Virgo-Scorpio.* Before its fall on earth the "Serpent" was *Ophis-Christos,* and after its fall it became Ophiomorphis-CHRESTOS. Everywhere the speculations of the Kabalists treat of Evil as a FORCE, which is antagonistic, but at the same time essential, to Good, as giving it vitality and existence, which it could never have had otherwise.

In human nature, evil denotes only the polarity of matter and spirit, a struggle for life between the two manifested Principles in Space and Time, which principles are one *per se,* inasmuch as they are rooted in the Absolute. In Kosmos, the equilibrium must be preserved. The operations of the two contraries produce harmony, like the centripetal and centrifugal forces, which are necessary to each other—mutually inter-dependent—"in order that both should live." If one is arrested, the action of the other will become immediately self-destructive.

There would be no *life* possible (in the *Mayavic* sense) without *Death,* nor regeneration and reconstruction without destruction. Plants would perish in eternal sunlight, and so would man, who would become an automaton without the exercise of his free will and aspirations after that sunlight, which would lose its being and value for him had he nothing but light. Good is infinite and eternal only in the eternally concealed from us, and this is why we imagine it eternal. On the mani-

fested planes, one equilibrates the other.

Having to trace the origin of the idea to the very beginnings of human mind, it is but just, meanwhile, to give his due even to the proverbial Devil. Antiquity knew of no isolated, thoroughly and absolutely bad "god of evil." Pagan thought represented good and evil as twin brothers, born from the same mother—Nature; so soon as that thought ceased to be Archaic, Wisdom too became Philosophy. In the beginning the symbols of good and evil were mere abstractions, Light and Darkness; then their types became chosen among the most natural and ever-recurrent periodical Cosmic phenomena—the Day and the Night, or the Sun and the Moon. Then the Hosts of the Solar and Lunar deities were made to represent them, and the Dragon of Darkness was contrasted with the Dragon of Light.

The Host of Satan is a Son of God, no less than the Host of the B'ni Alhim, those children of God coming to "present themselves before the Lord," their father (see *Job ii.*). According to Genesis, "The Sons of God" became the "Fallen Angels" only after perceiving that the daughters of men *were fair.* In the Indian philosophy, the *Suras* are among the earliest and brightest gods, and become *Asuras* only when dethroned by Brahmanical fancy.

Satan never assumed an anthropomorphic, individualised shape, until the creation by man, of a "one *living* personal god," had been accomplished; and then merely as a matter of prime necessity. A screen was needed; a scape-goat to explain the cruelty, blunders, and but too-evident injustice, perpetrated by him for whom absolute perfection, mercy, and goodness were claimed. This was the first Karmic effect of abandoning a philosophical and logical Pantheism, to build, as a prop for lazy man, "a merciful father in Heaven," whose daily and hourly actions as *Natura naturans,* the "comely mother but stone cold," belie the assumptions. This led to the primal twins, Osiris-Typhon, Ormazd-Ahriman, and finally Cain-Abel and the *tutti-quanti* of contraries.

Having commenced by being synonymous with Nature, "God," the Creator, ended by being made its author. Pascal settles the difficulty very cunningly: "Nature has perfections, in order to show that she is the image of God: and defects, in order to show that she is *only* his image," he says.

The further back one recedes into the darkness of prehistoric ages, the more philosophical does the prototypic figure of the later Satan be-

come. The first "Adversary" in individual human form that one meets with in old Puranic literature is one of her greatest Rishis and Yogis—Narada, surnamed the "Strife-maker." And he is a Brahmaputra, a son of Brahma, the male. Who the great "Deceiver" really is, one can ascertain by searching for him *with open eyes* and an unprejudiced mind, in every old cosmogony and Scripture. It is the anthropomorphised *Demiurge,* the Creator of Heaven and Earth, *when separated* from the collective Hosts of his fellow-Creators, whom, so to speak, he represents and synthesizes. It is *now* the God of *theologies.* "The thought is father to the wish." Once upon a time, a philosophical symbol left to perverse human fancy; afterwards fashioned into a fiendish, deceiving, cunning, and jealous God.

Few are those theists and believers in a personal God, who do not make of Satan the shadow of God; or who, confounding both, do not believe they have a right to pray to that idol asking its help and protection for the exercise and impunity of their evil and cruel deeds. "Lead us not into Temptation" is addressed daily to "our Father, which art in Heaven," and not to the Devil, by millions of human Christian hearts. They do so, repeating the very words put into the mouth of their Saviour, and do not give one thought to the fact that their meaning is contradicted point blank by James "the brother of the Lord." "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man" (James 1:13).

Why, then, say it is the Devil who tempts us, when the Church teaches us *on the authority of Christ* that it is God who does so? Open any pious volume in which the word "temptation" is defined in its theological sense, and forthwith you find two definitions: (1) "Those afflictions and troubles *whereby God tries his people*"; (2) Those means and enticements which the Devil makes use of to *ensnare* and allure mankind. (James 1:2, 12 and Matt. 6:13.) If accepted literally, the two teachings of Christ and James contradict each other, and what dogma can reconcile the two if the occult meaning is rejected?

Between the alternative allurements, wise will be that philosopher who will be able to decide where God disappears to make room for the Devil! Therefore when we read that "the Devil is a liar and the father of it," i.e., INCARNATE LIE, and are told in the same breath that Satan —the Devil—was a son of God and the most beautiful of his archangels, rather than believe that Father and Son are a gigantic, personi-

fied and eternal LIE, we prefer to turn to Pantheism and to Pagan philosophies for information.

Once that the key to Genesis is in our hands, it is the scientific and symbolical Kabala which unveils the secret. The great Serpent of the Garden of Eden and the "Lord God" are identical, and so are Jehovah and Cain ONE—that Cain who is referred to in theology as the "murderer" and the LIAR to God! Jehovah tempts the King of Israel to number the people, and Satan tempts him to do the same in another place. Jehovah turns into the fiery serpents to bite those he is displeased with; and Jehovah informs the brazen serpent that heals them. These short, and seemingly contradictory, statements in the Old Testament (contradictory because the two Powers are separated instead of being regarded as the two facets of one and the same thing) are the echoes—distorted out of recognition by exotericism and theology—of the universal and philosophical dogmas in nature, so well understood by the primitive Sages.

The true Buddhist, recognizing no "personal god," nor any "Father" and "Creator of Heaven and Earth," still believes in an *absolute consciousness,* "Adi-Buddha"; and the Buddhist philosopher *knows* that there are Planetary Spirits, the "Dhyan Chohans." But though he admits of "spiritual lives," yet, as they are temporary in eternity, even they, according to his philosophy, are "the *maya* of the day," the *illusions* of a "day of Brahma," a short manvantara of 4,320,000,000 years. The "Yin-Sin" is not for the speculations of men, for the Lord Buddha has strongly prohibited such inquiry.

If the Dhyan Chohans and all the invisible Beings—the *Seven* Centres and their direct Emanations, the *minor* centres of Energy—are the direct reflex of the ONE Light, yet men are far removed from these, since the whole of the *visible* Kosmos consists of "*self-produced* beings, the creatures of Karma." Thus regarding a personal God "as only a gigantic shadow thrown upon the void of space by the imagination of ignorant men," they teach that only "two things are (objectively) eternal, namely *Akasa* and *Nirvana*"; and that these two are ONE in reality, and but a *maya* when divided. "Buddhists deny creation and cannot conceive of a *Creator.*" "Everything has come out of Akasa (or Svabhavat on our earth) in obedience to a law of motion inherent in it, and after a certain existence passes away. Nothing ever came out of nothing." (*Buddhist Catechism.*)

# ON THE LOOKOUT

## Notes on Logotherapy

Students who have studied the unique emphases of Viktor E. Frankl's "Logotherapy" can hardly fail to be aware that this Viennese psychiatrist develops a number of fundamentally Theosophical ideas. As a Lookout comment on Frankl's *From Death Camp to Existentialism* endeavored to show (THEOSOPHY 48:88), Dr. Frankl focuses on "the noëtic and not the psychic dimension of man." These words are his, and he continues to discuss "the dimension of noëtic processes—call them spiritual groping or moral decisions—in contrast to psychic processes in general."

It is clear that Frankl's writings have appealed to a number of psychiatrists throughout the world. Dr. Frankl lectured at the Harvard University Summer Session last year and comment on "logotherapy" is now beginning to appear in the psychiatric literature of the United States. The *Journal of Individual Psychology* for November 1961, for example, contains a critique of Frankl's approach by Dr. Ferdinand Birnbaum, who points out one of the consequences of the psychic-noëtic dualism —one far different from the results of the dualism of Christian theology. Dr. Birnbaum writes:

> The para-religious aspect of meaning is the fulcrum in Frankl's theory. Kant gave his answer long ago when he said, "I can only will that there be meaning." But by willing that there be meaning I must commit myself to its realization.
>
> Through his logotherapy Frankl leads the patient to the experience of responsibility, i.e., by letting him experience his inescapable responsibility.

## A Deepening of "Natural Religion"

Dr. Birnbaum continues:

> If I understand Frankl correctly, he has arrived at the one new conclusion that social usefulness can no longer be the sole criterion for the right conduct of life.
>
> Frankl would like to give experimental support to that which is religious. From his lifelong devotion to suicide prevention, through his suffering in the concentration camp, he reached a deepening of his religious attitude. Having experienced the joy of his positive believing

attitude, he would like to make it available to all those who severely suffer psychologically. Where the nucleus of a specific religious attitude exists, Frankl tries to deepen it. Where such a nucleus does not exist, Frankl looks for a para-religious attitude and encourages that in the patient.

## Psychically Transcendent Values

An article, "The Spiritual Dimension in Existential Analysis," by Dr. Frankl in the November, 1959, issue of the *Journal of Individual Psychology* becomes specific on what Dr. Birnbaum calls "a value criterion beyond social usefulness":

> I believe that the dream of half a century has been dreamed out. I mean the dream that regarded the psyche as a mechanism and accordingly held that there was a technique for psychic cure. In other words, the dream considered that an explanation of psychic suffering was to be performed solely with the help of psychic technology. What begins to appear in the dawn are not sketches of a psychologized medicine, but of a humanized psychiatry.
>
> The neurotic's fatalism sometimes appeals to what educational and milieu influences "made" of him during his childhood, how they became his fate, etc. Thereby such people want to create an alibi for their weaknesses. They accept them as something given, instead of recognizing in them a task for re-education or, better, self-education.
>
> There are values the realization of which must be carried out beyond and independent of any human community. Especially regarding what we have called experiential values, the criterion of use for the community can claim no validity. The richness of values which is opened to the individual from artistic or nature experiences, even in his loneliness, is essentially and fundamentally independent of usefulness to the community.

## The Will to Meaning

Dr. Frankl, then, calls for a "psychotherapy which dares to follow man, his sickness and its etiology into the noëtic, spiritual dimension." And the needs of the noëtic man are reached only by the appeal of egoic meaning. Those who have lost their "will-to-meaning" because of entirely materialistic attitudes cannot be brought out of mental disturbance without therapy which *re-awakens* the will to meaning. Dr. Frankl offers this brief explanation of logotherapy:

> Neither the somatic nor the psychic alone constitute the genuinely human; rather, they represent only two sides of the human being.
>
> When we distinguish between logotherapy and psychotherapy, we use the latter term in the narrow sense, and, at that, intend the distinc-

tion only in a heuristic way. *Logos* now means not only *meaning,* but also the *spiritual.* The will-to-meaning is the subjective side of a spiritual reality in which the meaning is the objective side; at least it is objective insofar as the will is concerned with "finding" meaning and not at all with "giving" it.

The will-to-meaning is something elementary, something genuine and authentic, and as such ought to be taken seriously by psychotherapy.

Least of all can psychotherapy afford to ignore the will-to-meaning; instead, calling upon it involves a psychotherapeutic principle of the first rank. This can, under some circumstances, not only effect the preservation of psychic or somatic health but may be outright life-saving.

## APPEAL TO NOETIC IN THERAPY

A final quotation from Dr. Frankl's "A Spiritual Dimension":

Existential Analysis emphasizes the manifold character of body-mind-spirit within and in spite of the unity of human existence. It does this in order to be able to appeal to what is called in logotherapy the defiant power of man's spirit. If it should allow the spiritual person to be dissolved in a neutral noëtic-psychic-somatic existence, then to what could such an appeal be made? Whose defiant power could be appealed to? How could such an appeal be made when the distinction between the spiritual person and the psychosomatic pathological process has been lost as in this monistic picture of man? The psychotic individual is so dominated by, and imprisoned within, this existential mode that it is necessary to speak of an infiltration of psychosis into the individual's existence.

Existential Analysis attempts to be not only an analysis of the concrete person, that is, an analysis in the ontic sense, but also an analysis in the ontological sense; in other words, it attempts to be an analysis, an explication, an unfolding of the *essence* of personal existence, apart from the self-unfolding of personal existence as this happens in life and is made visible in biographies.

## REVIEW OF "REINCARNATION"

Among the favorable reviews elicited by the Head-Cranston volume, *Reincarnation: An East-West Anthology* (Julian Press, N.Y., 1961), is one appearing in the *American Theosophist* for March. This book, incidentally, is of such evident value to all Theosophists that it is being distributed by Theosophy Company, publishers of THEOSOPHY, and is available at most ULT centers. The *American Theosophist* review is of such a nature as to ensure that many members of the Society will wish

to have it for reference, and to circulate among interested acquaintances.

The review is by the British psychiatrist, Dr. Laurence J. Bendit, a psychical researcher and lecturer of considerable reputation in both England and the United States. Dr. Bendit writes:

> This book succeeds admirably in its aim: it gives a wide field of information on the views of many people, though only on the side of acceptance, not of the arguments for rejection of the concept. As such it will be of use to the student who still considers the matter of reincarnation to be of prime importance in his philosophy. The book can be firmly recommended.

### Measured Praise

> It is interesting to discover how widespread the belief in reincarnation is and has been. Even in ancient Christianity it existed (as witness the anathema on Origen, from which the Catholic Church now appears to be trying to extricate itself), while some modern Christians are quoted in favor of it being compatible with orthodox views. Due attention is paid to the difference between the idea of immortality and that of specific rebirth, but none is made between survival (i.e., a temporary posthumous existence of the psyche or personal soul after death of the body) and true immortality, which is the existence of the spirit for all time, or out of time. There seems little doubt that some of the authors quoted by isolated texts might well turn in their graves, if they are in them, at being quoted as believers in reincarnation because of some light remark of theirs. But on the whole the quotations are both relevant and well chosen, and they all show that their authors, even if they did not accept the principle of rebirth, at least believed it worthy of consideration.

### An Attitude Towards Study

As notes on the writings of Mr. N. Sri Ram, International President of the Theosophical Society, indicated in Lookout for April, the emphasis in the T.S. seems to be turning more and more to encouragement of philosophical evaluation. Dr. Bendit, clearly, is one who feels the need for this transition keenly—just as have many Theosophists within the membership of ULT. The February issue of the *American Theosophist*, for example, contains these remarks by Dr. Bendit in a brief article titled "Study: The Need for a New Approach." He writes:

> It is of little use to talk of Egos and Monads or so-called psychic bodies if we do not know what we mean by them in *fact*: that is, if we have no direct experience of them for ourselves. Yet every person who thinks at all *knows* that he thinks, feels, has intuitions: what he does

not realize is that in thinking he is actually experiencing the vehicle or *upadhi* through which *manas* expresses itself, that when he feels emotion, this is his astral or *kamic* nature, when he feels deeply yet with utter stillness, or has a deep intuitive and *impersonal* experience, he is actually aware of *Buddhi-Manas* or his higher Self. In other words, too little has been done to make the member of the Society aware of himself and of what he is doing, how he acts and reacts; yet this is the basis and aim of all theosophical experience. Moreover, in knowing himself and in knowing for himself, he must perforce also know others and, understanding them, he cannot help but feel his unity with them: so true Brotherhood is born.

## "Nonsectarian" Theosophy

In harmony with the introduction to the Theosophy Company pamphlet, *What is Theosophy? Its Nonsectarian Spirit,* are further remarks of Dr. Bendit's as to the relation between Theosophy as a universal *gnosis* and any organization which seeks to embody a program based upon its implications:

The Society came into being at a time when mankind was about to start a new phase of evolution. It was to, and indeed, still has to, move from using the materialistic, pragmatic, mind, as its main focus of purpose and awareness. It has to shift to a new level, that of the universal, intuitive mind, where *meaning* and not merely facts count. At this level too, the bonds of time and space are loosened, if not transcended, and the eternal and enduring is felt. Theosophy is, essentially, of that timeless, enduring quality: not the statements which some have tried to tell us are the doctrines of Theosophy. For those so-called doctrines or teachings are only what we fumble with when we try to express truth in the form of concepts which the workaday mind can easily comprehend and fit in with other materialistic ideas. The Society is, as it were, an *avatar,* or incarnation of Theosophy: it does not contain Theosophy itself. It is however one of the groups which are feeling always after the true philosophy of Being.

## Indigenous Persuasions of Reincarnation

A recent survey of the relationship between contemporary Christianity and the youth of Great Britain, published as *Teenage Religion* (SCM Press, London, 1961), reveals that the idea of reincarnation often occurs in the thinking of youths when they reflect in an unprejudiced manner. *Teenage Religion* reports the results of research as organized by Mr. Harold Loukes, Reader in Education in the University of Oxford, and was published under the auspices of the Study and Research Committee of the Institute of Christian Education. The method chosen was simply

to report the actual replies of young persons to questions concerning religious belief. Of particular interest to Theosophists is the fact that the idea of reincarnation was introduced by teenagers themselves in no less than five instances.

## Ideas Expressed

Here is an example of dialogue between a member of Mr. Loukes' research group and some teenagers in a classroom:

*You pray for someone who dies, and when they're buried—but is that the end of the person?*

No.

They say you either go to Heaven or Hell—well, I don't believe in two places like that.

Some say you come back as an animal.

*Let's sort this out—some of you believe that there's a life beyond, although you don't know what it is, and some of you believe that they come back into the world.*

Yes.

*Only one girl has said that. Does anyone else believe that they come back into this world?*

Yes (quite a few).

I think they come back as a different person.

*But you think they might come back as animals.*

I was told when I was little that I might come back as a cat or a dog, but when you grow up you don't believe that.

*Well, this idea of being born back into the world—you would say that it is pretty common?*

Yes (majority).

*Well, that is an oriental idea, not a Christian idea at all. It comes from the Orient, from the heathen faiths, and it's very interesting that it is so widely spread.*

## "Creeping" Belief

Later, a questioner, discussing what benefits may be obtained in another life from the effort to live a worthy existence in this one, notes that "the belief in reincarnation creeps in"; again, unexpectedly, a youth bluntly interrupted a discussion of man's relation to God by saying that "I believe in reincarnation and therefore when you die you will be born again as a new person." In a subsequent chapter, Mr. Loukes, himself a Christian and sponsored by a Christian organization, notes the emergence in teenage thought of "the curious streak of re-incarnation, respectable in the east, odd, yet morally attractive, in the west."

## FURTHER EXAMPLES

As the Loukes group continued the interviews, variations of the reincarnation theme were repeatedly encountered—with no apparent evidence of indoctrination or conditioning to account for its emergence. Take, for example, the following:

> I'm not struck on saying there is a heaven. I think you come back to life again.
>
> . . .
>
> I think when I die I will come back as someone else and carry on like that. I don't believe in heaven and hell because millions of people are dying every day, and there wouldn't be enough room for us all, we would be meeting stone age men and so on.
>
> . . .
>
> I don't believe in heaven. I think people just die and are born again (re-incarnated).
>
> . . .
>
> I don't think there is a heaven. Nobody's been there and come back so nobody knows. When you die you come into the world as someone else.

Members of the Loukes group were puzzled and apparently only slightly displeased by this revelation of autonomous thought on the question of immortality. Mr. Loukes' own objection to the idea of reincarnation is mentioned politely in one of the closing chapters, as he perpetuates a philosophical misconception: "Reincarnation," he remarks, "cannot be disproved; but it is open to the objection that it makes *this* life of less importance because it gives us further chances. We do not need to listen to a history lesson if we know we shall get the same thing tomorrow. And our conviction is that this life does matter, in a once-for-all kind of way."

## STUDY GROUP FOR YALE STUDENTS

Largely spontaneous formation of new ULT groups has been on the increase during 1961/62. One example is a development in New Haven, Conn., where the interest of some Yale students became immediately apparent. A report on "Theosophy Study Begins at Yale" appears under this title in the *Yale Daily News* for Jan. 23, and reads in part as follows:

> Students concerned with religious self-examination are invited to join a New Haven study group in theosophy.
>
> Theosophy is the search for the truths common to all religions and philosophies. It emphasizes Eastern religions and includes belief in the Karma Cycle of life and reincarnation.

Roger Montgomery, 1925, sponsored the first meeting Wednesday. He is familiar with many religions. His father was a Presbyterian minister, his wife is a converted Roman Catholic, and he has been a member of Congregational and Unitarian Churches in New Haven.

## Theosophical Ethics in History

The report continues with a brief reference to the conception of karma as a basis for ethics, and then continues:

> According to theosophy, salvation comes through works since reincarnation allows worldly punishment for all sins and rewards for all virtues. Karma is the fate which men, families, or nations have accumulated by their past actions. Each person may perfect himself spiritually.
>
> The Theosophical Society was founded by Madame H. P. Blavatsky in New York in 1875. Its three objects were universal brotherhood, study of all religions and sciences, and investigation of unknown parts of nature and man's resources.
>
> The ideas of the original society have been inherited by several movements including the United Lodge of Theosophists.

## Modern Superstition in Ancient Dress

The New York *Times* for Dec. 12, 1961, announces that "the builders of the Bankers Trust Building . . . are taking no chances with bad luck." It explains:

> At the topping-out ceremonies yesterday nearly all the symbols used in such rites for the last 3,000 years were hauled to the top of the thirty-story structure. The ceremony celebrates the raising of the structural steel to its highest point.
>
> Among the items hoisted to the top . . . were a basket of eggs, a flag, three handkerchiefs, a small fir tree, sheaves of corn and other vegetables, ribbons, garlands of flowers, a pair of handcuffs and a jar of chicken blood.
>
> The ancient Aztecs and Romans often sacrificed humans to placate the spirits. However the Chinese came up with a modification: they used chicken blood in the hope of fooling the spirits. The handcuffs date to the Persian general Xerxes. . . . To punish the spirits in the Hellespont that caused one bridge to collapse, Xerxes had the water lashed and then threw in a pair of handcuffs so the water spirits could not do any more harm. The pine tree was introduced in Scandinavian countries around 700 A.D. More recently, construction workers raised handkerchiefs to commemorate the achievement. The handkerchiefs evolved into the present-day practice of raising a flag.

## THE CASE FOR ANTI-VIVISECTION

In a pamphlet, *The Better Way—An Alternative to Vivisection,* M. Beddow Bayly, a prominent anti-vivisectionist, counters the assertion that "anti-vivisectionists are the enemies of scientific research and that the abolition of vivisection would put an end to medical progress" by listing eleven other methods which are as "scientifically sound" as they are "ethically right." Mr. Bayly prepares the ground:

> There is always a right and a wrong way of conducting the search for knowledge; it would be contrary to any logical belief in an ordered Universe to maintain that the adoption of ethically objectionable methods can be the sole means of attaining knowledge needed for the achievement of health and happiness by mankind. Fortunately it is quite easy to show that we are by no means faced with this dilemma—the acceptance of a creed which does violence to the highest instincts of all humane people. . . .
>
> It is of value when arguing the case with those less convinced of the need to take this uncompromising attitude [that of the dedicated anti-vivisectionist] to be able to bring forward evidence showing the value of alternative methods. The wide extent to which purely clinical observation and experience have, throughout medical history, been successful in discovering and developing methods of diagnosis, treatment and prevention of disease is frequently unrealised or lost sight of.

## CLINICAL RESEARCH

Among the methods of research which Mr. Bayly lists as "ethically sound" are included the long-term assessment of analgesics and drugs whose immediate reactions chemists are able to assay, use of various instruments for diagnosing and treating disease, physiotherapy in all its branches, diet in relation to the individual (race and temperament), and the whole field of psycho-therapeutic medicine. All these, he says, are "unconnected with experiments on animals" and "present opportunities for much further research." Mr. Bayly foresees certain hopeful signs:

> Fortunately, not only are some of the leading minds in the medical profession laying greater stress upon the importance of clinical research, but signs are not wanting that the general practitioner will be called upon to engage in this work to a far greater extent in the not too distant future and thus provide, as a family doctor dealing with the Whole Man, a useful and effective alternative to the crude fumblings of the present-day research worker who offends both scientific and ethical principles by the subjection of living and sentient animals to the barbarous and misleading experiments of the vivisection laboratory.